

BRAHM NORWICH & GEORGE KOUTSOURIS

**AN INCLUSIVE MODEL OF TARGETING LITERACY
TEACHING FOR 7-8 YEAR OLD CHILDREN WHO ARE
STRUGGLING TO LEARN TO READ:**

THE INTEGRATED GROUP READING (IGR) APPROACH

INTRODUCTION

This chapter draws on the background thinking and research which has informed a current research project that has been evaluating an additional literacy teaching programme designed for 7-8 year old children who are struggling to learn to read. The rationale for the chapter is to illustrate challenges and practices in inclusive teaching in a very important area of teaching and learning. The framework of thinking that informs the design of the Integrated Group Reading (IGR) approach is the wave model (Griffiths & Stuart, 2013; Rose, 2006). In its UK form the wave model distinguishes between wave 1 (or universal or *Quality First* teaching), wave 2 or targeted teaching and wave 3 specialist teaching. In its typical presentation and use, the model is unclear about important questions in relation to what characterises each wave and what their relationship is to each other. One of the key issues is to what extent wave 1 teaching is meant to be adapted or differentiated for the diversity of children in a class. Is wave 1 teaching meant to provide for children who struggle to learn to read, for example for more than a year, and whose reading is well below some notional average? It is widely assumed that wave 1 teaching differentiates to some degree for different rates and styles of learning, but if some children cross a cut-off (say, well below average attainment for a year) and move to wave 2 (targeted teaching) how is this to be organised? In targeted teaching, designed to be supplementary to wave 1 teaching, are the identified children also participating in wave 1 teaching? Or does wave 2 teaching become their main form of literacy teaching? Also, how does the kind of teaching of reading in wave 2 (in terms of assumptions about reading and how to learn to read) relate to the kind of teaching done in wave 1? And, who teaches the wave 2 identified children and where does this teaching take place?

In this chapter, we will focus mainly more on the relationship between waves 1 and 2 than wave 3. We will consider these questions with respect to a particular form of inclusive targeted literacy teaching, the IGR approach and in doing so examine issues about the wave model and the relationship between assumptions about inclusivity and where teaching takes place, who is involved and how. We will also consider curriculum questions about what is involved in learning to read and the deployment of teaching assistants (TA). The chapter is organised into three

B. NORWICH AND G. KOUTSOURIS

parts. The first part will summarise a review of recent international literature about current models of additional support in the context of reading teaching (or instruction, to use the US term). In the second part, we outline the IGR programme as an alternate model of inclusive provision, explaining the significance of the term 'integrated'. In the third and final part, we discuss the implications of the IGR approach for teaching the diversity of children who are struggling to learn to read in terms of what inclusive teaching means.

PART 1. CURRENT MODELS OF ADDITIONAL SUPPORT IN THE CONTEXT OF EARLY READING TEACHING

Literature Search Methods and Main Findings

This discussion builds on the findings of a literature review that was conducted by the authors to explore the nature of additional support for children struggling to learn to read. The particular focus of the search was the delivery arrangements of early literacy interventions that have been evaluated systematically and reflect the current models of provision for pupils who struggle in their learning to read.

ERIC and BEI (and Google Scholar as a supplementary resource) were searched for reading-related literacy interventions published between 2006 and 2016. Studies were included only if they used an experimental (randomised control trials and quasi-experimental studies) or a pre- and post-test design and the sample was primary age struggling or delayed readers. Studies focusing on particular SEN categories were not included. We focused on school-based interventions and studies published in English.

Using these criteria, 29 studies were found which were then categorised according to the levels of the wave model in the UK (Griffiths & Stuart, 2013; Rose, 2006) or the tier model in the US (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006), also sometimes called the response to intervention (RTI) model. As mentioned above, the basic model describes most often three waves of support: *wave 1* whole class teaching (or *Quality First* to highlight that each child is entitled to quality teaching); *wave 2* additional (most often group) support for some pupils; and *wave 3* highly intensive and personalised intervention for a few pupils. In terms of the RTI model approach, the nature of teaching is expected to change at each wave to become more intensive, and this is achieved by: '(a) using more teacher-centred, systematic, and explicit instruction; (b) conducting it more frequently; (c) adding to its duration; (d) creating smaller and more homogenous student groupings; (e) relying on instructors with greater expertise' (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006, p. 94).

From these 29 studies, seven were categorised as targeting wave 1, 11 studies wave 2 and nine wave 3 (the remaining two combined more than one waves). More specifically:

Wave 1. Seven studies evaluated reading interventions offered in whole class teaching with the aim to improve reading outcomes for all pupils. These

interventions were delivered during whole class sessions by the class teacher (e.g. Boardman et al., 2016) or involved computer-based delivery (as for instance Shannon et al., 2015).

Wave 2. All 11 wave 2 interventions were delivered outside of the regular classroom sessions. The majority (seven out of 11 studies) were delivered by specially hired and trained instructors (most often non-regular school staff) (e.g. Vaughn et al., 2016; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012), or by special educational needs (SEN) teachers (Lovett et al., 2008) while the rest were computer-based. These interventions were delivered in addition to the wave 1 literacy teaching, outside of the regular class, and at a time that would not conflict with this teaching (Cirino et al. 2009; Ritchey et al., 2012). Torgesen et al. (2010), for example, wrote that ‘none of the students were pulled out of the classroom when students were receiving reading instruction from their classroom teachers as a whole class’ (p. 44). The examined wave 2 interventions were delivered by people other than the class teacher, thus it was seen as important to ensure that the pupils would be able to attend their wave 1 teacher-delivered whole classroom sessions.

Wave 3. Wave 3 interventions were delivered one-to-one, and mostly in a way similar to the wave 2 interventions (in addition to core teaching, and out of the regular literacy sessions). Ardoin et al. (2016) notes in relation to this that ‘to ensure that intervention was supplementary (i.e., additional to typical instruction), sessions took place during teacher-selected intervals in which students were not receiving reading/language arts instruction. Specifically, sessions generally occurred in the morning prior to the official start of the school day or during morning announcements’ (p. 20). Wave 3 interventions were delivered by a combination of specially trained tutors, SEN teachers and TAs (there was also a computer-based intervention). As the majority of the UK-based studies (four out of five studies) were targeting wave 3, a pattern emerged: with reference to the people responsible for delivering the intervention, most UK-based studies (three out of four studies) used TAs (regular school staff), whereas specially hired and trained tutors (most likely non-regular school staff) were only used in US-based studies. From the remaining wave 3 interventions, one from Netherlands used TAs and another from Sweden, SEN teachers. This, and especially the US/UK difference, seems to reflect cultural differences in delivery arrangements for school-based interventions across contexts.

The Current Model of Providing Additional Support

Thus, wave 2 and 3 interventions not involving computer-based delivery were all administered in addition to the wave 1 teaching in withdrawal sessions run by people other than the class teacher (TAs, trained tutors or SEN teachers). The people responsible for teaching wave 2 and 3 interventions were either regular school staff (most likely in the UK) or specially recruited (most likely in the US). By using regular school staff such as TAs to deliver an intervention (the model

mostly used in the UK) (as in See et al., 2015; Clarke et al., 2010; Duff et al., 2008; Hatcher et al., 2006), schools were making a long-term investment. This is because most TA-delivered intervention programmes included training, meaning that the schools would be able to continue using the intervention in the long term if they wished to. By contrast, all US studies that did not involve computer-based delivery used some form of specially hired tutors to deliver interventions targeting wave 2 or 3 (for example Vaughn et al., 2016; Fien et al., 2015). It is likely in a research context that this approach would be considered preferable, as it allowed US researchers to have better control over fidelity of intervention implementation. Cirino et al. (2009), for example, highlighted in relation to the trained tutors who delivered a wave 3 intervention: ‘ratings of tutors were found to have adequate validity, and tutors were found to exhibit a high degree of adherence to positive instructional practices (e.g., materials were ready, high instructor enthusiasm, consistent redirection of off-task behavior)’ (p. 762). This level of control might not be achievable in the UK-based studies where interventions were delivered by regular school staff (teachers or TAs) as part of a demanding school timetable. Yet, with the US model, schools might find it difficult to continue to use an intervention after a trial has finished, since regular class teachers would not have knowledge and experience of its delivery.

The Over-reliance on TAs

So, using regular school staff to deliver an intervention can offer certain advantages. However, the use of pull-out sessions and a reliance on people other than the classroom teacher (such as TAs) to provide extra support can invite ‘a separation effect’ (EEF, 2015, p. 15), with certain pupils spending considerably less time with the teacher and having fewer opportunities for peer interaction. The Making a Statement (MaSt) study (Webster & Blatchford, 2013), designed to explore the teaching, support and interactions experienced by pupils with statements of Special Educational Needs (SEN), found that the educational experiences of pupils holding a statement was characterised by a high degree of separation and TA support:

Compared to average attaining pupils, statemented pupils experienced less time in whole class contexts and a much higher degree of one-to-one interaction with TAs – often at the expense of interactions with teachers and peers (Webster & Blatchford, 2013, p. 2).

The result of this practice is that TAs can have more responsibility than class teachers for pupils with SEN statements. Therefore these pupils are likely to receive a less appropriate and lower quality pedagogic experience – for example, the Deployment and Impact of Support Staff (DISS) found that the more support pupils received from support staff (including TAs), the less progress they made (Blatchford & Webster, 2014). Though there is a risk of over-generalising this study to situations where appropriate support is provided by TAs, such a finding is not surprising if additional support involves inadequately trained and

supported TAs and a lack of on-going class teacher involvement (as the literature discussed earlier indicates). Though the above review of school-based interventions might involve the adequate training of TAs or tutors, the current model of evaluated support is still based on pull-out sessions which do not involve class teachers in teaching those children who are struggling in their literacy.

Teaching Differentiation in Quality First

This review and discussion also raises the question of whether *Quality First* wave 1 programmes are sufficiently differentiated for those struggling to learn, and why it is that programmes at wave 2 or 3 are offered as supplementary programmes. When *Quality First* provision does not necessarily offer sufficient differentiation, lesson attendance could be seen as learning time lost for those who are struggling. Though there has not been much research on this topic, a US study by Al Otaiba et al. (2014) found that children who had immediate access to wave 2 and 3, rather than a wait of eight weeks within typical RTI procedures before receiving support, had improved reading outcomes at the end of first grade (Year 1 in UK). But, even in the model of this study, as in the other reviewed studies, wave 2/3 support is delivered as supplementary teaching, often done outside the regular class and/or by someone other than the class teacher. Is it possible for children in need of more targeted wave 2 teaching to receive this in a regular class setting during wave 1 teaching and be taught by the class teacher? What organisational arrangements would make this possible and how would TAs be deployed to support such an arrangement?

PART 2. THE IGR PROGRAMME AS AN ALTERNATE MODEL OF INCLUSIVE PROVISION

The IGR programme was designed and developed in response to these ongoing issues. It is an early intervention for delayed Year 2 and 3 readers (Stebbing, 2016) which attempts to provide wave 2 targeted teaching in a regular class setting during wave 1 teaching, taught by the class teacher and supported by a TA. By using a whole class group reading organisation model, the programme enables the teacher to support those children struggling to learn to read in the regular class and attempts to address an overreliance on pull-out sessions and TA support.

The programme provides teachers with a core set of story-based materials (a set of 52 short books with accompanying story-specific games and supplementary phonics games), and a language-based methodology and lesson structure which teachers deliver on a twice-weekly basis in the classroom. In between the teacher-led IGR lessons there are in addition two highly structured TA-led one-to-one consolidation sessions for the children.

The IGR programme is 'integrated' in two key senses of the term: integrated in IGR refers not only to the inclusive aspect of the classroom-based organisation but

also to the integration of several discrete research-informed teaching approaches that underpin and justify its methodology, as we will discuss below.

IGR Organisation and Relevance to Schools

Not only does the teacher have the main role in teaching the wave 2 IGR programme (rather than the TA, as is frequently found), but IGR with its teacher and TA sessions takes the place of typical wave 1 provision for those most struggling with reading in the class. IGR adopts a group reading model of classroom organisation (influenced by Guided Reading discussed in the next section) where a class is organised into several groups (four-five), one of which is the IGR group. The intensity of this wave 2 teaching is achieved through four 30-minute sessions each week (two with the teacher and two with the TA) as part of the usual group reading organisation for all pupils. After initial screening using a teacher scoring scale, three to four pupils who would benefit from literacy support are selected to form an IGR reading group. The teacher teaches the IGR group twice a week using the programme materials and a structured teaching routine. The TA works with the group in-between the teacher sessions for consolidation also using the programme materials and a TA-specific routine. Teacher and TAs have very discrete roles, with the teacher preserving the main role. Teachers and TAs communicate regarding the fine detail of IGR pupils' reading progress or difficulties on a daily basis, using a Teacher-TA Daily Record book. In this way, IGR is designed to be part of the usual group reading schedule but it also allows teachers to organise their group reading rota in a more structured and efficient way for all the pupils in the class. It also enables them to teach each group at least once a week while working twice a week with the IGR group. During teacher-led IGR, the rest of the classroom works with the support of a TA on well-planned and structured group reading-related activities (such as independent reading, comprehension tasks, dictionary work, and computer literacy programmes).

As discussed, this organisation model stands in contrast to many of the evaluated wave 2 intervention programmes where a TA or a specially hired tutor has the main teaching role. With IGR organisation, the role of the TA is an integral aspect of the programme but follows on in a clearly specified way from the work of the teacher.

Beyond Guided Reading

Guided Reading can be a useful context for the teaching of early reading (Iaquinta, 2006), yet other research suggests that teachers are often confused about its purposes (Ford & Opitz, 2008). It might also be argued that the purposes and strategies of Guided Reading might be less relevant to pupils who are still in the early stages of learning to read.

The focus and aim of Guided Reading has been interpreted to be the development and cultivation of self-monitoring and independence in reading (NLS, 1998; Pinnell & Fountas, 2010), often meaning that books or parts of books are

introduced to the children with the aim of ensuring maximum levels of text comprehension (and the teacher assuming the role of guide/inquisitor). Such an approach can mean that there is little time for reading itself, which in this context is not the main aim of the lesson. By contrast, the IGR programme is a self-contained learning-to-read programme with its own materials and story- and play-based methodology, with the teacher as participant/leader. IGR helps teachers proceed in a systematic and very gradual way with pre-literate children needing to make progress in a step-by-step way. In other words, IGR is for pupils who have not yet mastered reading, whereas Guided Reading focuses on the development of comprehension strategies and complex text exploration with pupils who have reached the stage of being relatively independent as readers.

Systematic Integration of Current Approaches to Reading

As indicated above, the second key sense of ‘integrated’ in IGR is the systematic integration of current research evidence on the teaching of reading that informs and underpins its programme design.

Phonics teaching. Substantial recent research shows that phonics teaching is not only the most examined teaching approach, but the one with the greatest efficacy for reading and spelling gains (for example Galuschka et al., 2014; Torgerson et al., 2006). However, the efficacy of different phonics approaches is still debated (Henbest & Apel, 2017). A number of studies consistently report no difference between synthetic and analytic phonics (Di Stasio et al., 2012; Ehri et al., 2001; Kyle et al., 2013), yet there are few studies supporting a difference (synthetic over analytic phonics: Christensen & Bowey, 2005; Johnston & Watson, 2004; and analytic over synthetic: Walton et al., 2001). The IGR programme adopts a mainly analytic phonics component based on onset and rhyme, but it is currently being developed to also include story-specific synthetic phonics activities.

In addition, IGR incorporates the support of phonic skill development within a comprehensive, story-based approach. It exists in a context of UK national ‘one way only’ synthetic phonics teaching but seeks to offer children who have proved unresponsive to this teaching a whole-to-parts route to reading where synthetic phonics becomes meaning-based and ‘a posteriori’ as well as an ‘a priori’ route to word learning. It is also open to whatever lessons are learned in its application and is designed to respond and adapt to new research findings (such as the importance of the explicit teaching of phonics). For example, Reading Recovery has been criticised by some commentators (such as Reynolds & Wheldall, 2007) who have an issue with programmes that have been trademarked and become more difficult to subsequently change.

Oral language skills. In addition, early progress in reading has been shown to depend on children’s oral language skills (Bowyer-Crane et al., 2008; Clarke et al., 2010; Nation & Snowling, 2004). For example, Clarke et al. (2010) found that in a

comparison between three treatment groups, an oral language training treatment group made better gains in reading comprehension from the end of the intervention to an eleven-month follow-up. They concluded that difficulties in reading comprehension partly reflect underlying oral language weaknesses calling for suitable teaching. Bowyer-Crane et al. (2008) also found that oral language training programmes can improve vocabulary and grammatical skills.

IGR also has a strong story-telling aspect aiming to enable the development of children's oral skills. Story-telling has particularly been explored as a way to promote language and literacy development, especially in the early years, with various study designs (Dickinson & Smith 1994; Isbell et al., 2004; Peck, 1989; Sulzby, 1985; Valencia & Sulzby, 1991).

Word games. Research shows that word games can support the reading skills and engagement of children who struggle to learn to read (Raffaele Mendez et al., 2016; Jasmine & Schiesl, 2009; Charlton et al., 2005). For instance, Raffaele Mendez et al. (2016) report significant pre- and post-test gains for a reading intervention named *Reading by Design* that involves board games to practice sight words and word attack skills, and foster engagement. In addition, Charlton et al. (2005) found that games can accelerate learning when they are combined with teacher instruction. IGR includes four reading games, each with a distinct pedagogic role (overlearning consolidation at the level of word and sentence, phonics practice, and advance organisation at the level of unfamiliar vocabulary).

Elements associated with Reading Recovery. The importance of detailed responses to reading in small group as well as one-to-one contexts, and the monitoring of reading over time are elements that are associated with Reading Recovery (Clay, 1994; Doyle, 2013; What Works Clearinghouse, 2013). Clay (2001) argued that teachers can foster and support active constructive problem-solving through the regular monitoring of reading; self-monitoring, and self-correction from the first lesson, are also emphasised, to help learners understand that they must take over the expansion of their own competencies. Like Reading Recovery, IGR operates by engaging children at the cognitive level through word and phrase game-playing dynamics and group reading, encouraging collaborative problem solving, and enabling teachers to monitor progress closely.

Elements associated with Paired Reading (PR). A key element of the IGR approach to small group reading is its collaborative approach to reading and problem solving with the teacher as leader/participant. Experience from *Paired Reading (PR)* suggests that this is a valuable approach (Miller et al., 2010; Topping et al., 2011; Topping, 2014; Topping & Lindsay, 1992). Topping (2014) describes the *PR* method as 'a form of supported oral reading which enables students to access and comprehend texts somewhat above their independent readability level [...] This structured support used with high motivation texts offers dysfluent readers a flow experience, which is likely to impact on their reading style and socio-emotional aspects of the reading process' (p. 59). Topping et al. (2011)

THE INTEGRATED GROUP READING (IGR) APPROACH

report significant gains from a randomised control trial exploring *PR* in reading and self-esteem measures. Miller et al. (2010) also found significant gains in self-esteem using a pre-and post-test design.

The delivery of structured, teacher-led supported oral reading in IGR groups of four children (group not too big for personalised support, but not too small to allow for whole class teacher-led delivery) contrasts with intervention programmes of similar intensity that have mainly a one-to-one focus (Brooks, 2016). This aspect of the design of the IGR programme can be seen in the context of the Elbaum et al. (2000) meta-analysis finding that comparing one-to-one with small-group supplemental instruction showed no advantage for the one-to-one programmes.

In sum, the IGR programme responds to some of the key contemporary challenges in teaching early literacy to a diversity of pupils in primary classrooms and addresses/includes evidence-based strategies as integral in its design. Using the guided or group organisational model it enables children who are significantly delayed in learning to read (selected by their teacher or standardised assessment as reading below their classmates) to engage in an intensive programme geared to their needs in a wave 1 teaching setting (*wave 2 programme integrated into a wave 1 setting*). It does not expose these children to a wave 1 programme that might not suit their learning needs and give them additional teaching at wave 2 as a supplementary programme, often taught by a TA. IGR is taught by the teacher and the TA complements rather than substitutes for the class teacher. As an intensive group based programme it is based on research informed principles and practices (*research-informed principles integrated into teaching practice*).

PART 3. IMPLICATIONS OF IGR FOR INCLUSIVE TEACHING

In the final section we consider to what extent and in what ways the IGR approach is an inclusive teaching approach. To answer this question, we will start by considering what is meant by inclusive education and teaching. For the purposes of this chapter we will analyse two positions that illustrate the perspective we adopt. The first comes from the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) which said of inclusive education that it is: ‘All children learning together, *wherever possible*, regardless of any difficulties or difference they have’ (Salamanca Statement, UNESCO, 1994). The second is a more recent statement about inclusive pedagogy which is defined as: ‘An approach to teaching and learning that supports teachers to respond to individual differences between learners, *but avoids* marginalisation’ (Black-Hawkins & Florian 2012)

Based on these statements, inclusive teaching is about togetherness in learning and responding to individual differences. Yet, both statements in their own way involve qualifications. In the Salamanca Statement it is ‘*wherever possible*’, implying that there might be some limits to togetherness. In the second statement, responding to individual differences has to be in a way that ‘*avoids* marginalisation’. We suggest that possible limits to togetherness might be the value

of responding to individual differences, on one hand, and that recognising differences, or what is commonly called differentiation, has the potential to be enabling and stigmatising (marginalising). We interpret the above statements as pointing to a dilemma or a balance of risks about how to respond to difference / differentiation. This is the *dilemma of difference* perspective on inclusive teaching (Norwich, 2014) which recognizes that teaching involves trying to achieve several values, such as responding to individual differences (or needs) and being positive and respectful of learners (not marginalising or devaluing). When these values clash there are dilemmas that require a balancing of risks; so, though the aim is to have it ‘all ways’ there may be limits which are to do with the tension between values (responding to differences/needs and avoiding marginalisation). This balancing of risks involves finding creative ways to resolve the tension, something which will depend on both context and resources.

One way to examine whether the IGR programme achieves inclusive teaching and how it deals with dilemmas of difference is to examine IGR in terms of a contemporary perspective of inclusive pedagogy - *Inclusive pedagogical approach in action* (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). This approach to inclusive pedagogy makes two key assumptions: that difference is part of the human condition and all children can make progress in their learning; and that there is a commitment to support all learners while rejecting that the presence of some holds back others. Regarding teachers’ beliefs, it is also assumed that teachers are capable of teaching all learners and this involves replacing a ‘fixed view’ of ‘ability’ with an open-ended learning potential perspective. When translated into an approach in action, these authors identify several key practical principles:

- Making learning opportunities for *all* to participate in classroom life
- Extending what is ordinarily available for all; rather than learning activities for *most* alongside additional/different activities for *some* who experience difficulties
- Differentiation by pupil choice for everyone and rejection of ability grouping
- A flexible approach is required driven by needs of learner rather than by curriculum coverage
- Seeing difficulties in learning as professional challenges rather than learner deficits

It is possible to criticise these principles as overly fixed and prescriptive and also as tending to identify false oppositions. For example; here are some questions about these inclusive teaching principles: i. ‘differentiation by pupil choice’ – is there a place for pupil choice and teacher determination? ii. ‘reject ability grouping’ – are there no benefits to temporary subject ability grouping? iii. ‘seeing difficulties...as professional challenges’ – can some difficulties related to persistent child factors still be considered professional challenges? Nevertheless, these inclusive pedagogy principles are a useful basis for examining the inclusivity of the IGR approach, since they represent important values (such as respect for all, placing the learner first, believing that all learners can progress) that can however be translated into different pedagogical approaches/ decisions.

THE INTEGRATED GROUP READING (IGR) APPROACH

In relation to these principles, IGR is designed to make opportunities to learn to read open to children struggling to read in a class and to do so through participating in a group or guided reading classroom organisation model. It can also be seen to extend the teaching of reading to those who are struggling to read in Years 2 and 3 into a wave 1 setting. The teaching approach used in IGR has been designed using research-informed principles and strategies based on a combination of approaches to reading (as discussed earlier) including phonics, as opposed to phonics-only approaches, i.e. the approach to reading used most often with children in years 2 and 3 in England (Rose, 2006).

The IGR approach and materials can be used with other groups to the extent that they are relevant to them (e.g. phonics games), not just with those most struggling with reading. Using IGR materials more broadly can address the issue that there is a continuum of progress in learning to read and some children might benefit from using elements of an IGR approach even if they do not need the full programme. This flexibility of IGR shows that the supposed dichotomy between 'extend what is ordinarily available for all' and 'learning activities for *most*' alongside 'different activities for some' is a false distinction.

Furthermore, IGR is clearly based on current reading ability grouping in the group organisation model, but in practice there can be flexibility in how children are grouped depending on how they respond to teaching. Nor is there an assumption in IGR that children cannot learn to read and nor is there a 'fixed' view about ability. In grouping children and using a particular set of materials that are visibly different from those used with other children, there is a risk that these children will be marked out as different and possibly seen as marginal and so devalued by others. However, given that the teacher in the IGR approach rotates around all class reading groups, this not only gives struggling readers the privilege of being taught by their teacher, but could also serve to 'normalise' wave 2 intensive teaching programmes. Whether there is any devaluation in the IGR approach is an empirical matter and will depend on how IGR is implemented; it is not something to be decided in advance by overly prescriptive 'inclusive pedagogy' principles.

Finally, as IGR involves teachers who take the lead in teaching those who struggle most in learning to read, such a teaching approach also supports teachers themselves in their continuing professional development. This in turn can result in wider gains for other children in their classes. Professional challenge is not the opposite of recognising the presence of learner difficulties. The IGR programme is also a flexible approach in being driven by monitoring the responses of children in groups of four, while also being driven by a particular curriculum model of learning to read and a corresponding tightly sequenced range of learning activities (reading stories, collaborative problem-solving, word games, drawing etc.) which are research-informed. As stated, 'driven by needs of learner rather than by curriculum coverage' is a false opposition, in the sense that curriculum can be flexible (as in the case of IGR) to adjust to learner needs.

Concluding Comments

This chapter has been about the principles, theory and research underlying the IGR approach. To what extent IGR can be an inclusive approach to wave 2 early reading teaching is partly an empirical matter, the results of which will be reported in other papers at the end of the evaluation project. Questions such as these and many others – whether IGR teachers accept responsibility for teaching all pupils; in what way can a class management model involve the work of TAs; whether the IGR group having teaching in usual lesson time affect the way children and parents feel about visibility in a ‘struggling readers’ group – will be answered through the evaluation of the IGR programme (main project report: Norwich et al., 2018). Whatever the answers, it will still be evident that the issues raised by an IGR type approach will continue to challenge future theory and practice about general and additional teaching that will have a bearing on the future of inclusive teaching.

REFERENCES

- Al Otaiba, S., Connor, C. M., Folsom, J. S., Wanzek, J., Greulich, L., Schatschneider, C. & Wagner, R. K. (2014). To Wait in Tier 1 or Intervene Immediately: A Randomized Experiment Examining First-Grade Response to Intervention in Reading. *Exceptional Children*, 81(1), 11-27.
- Ardoin, S. P., Binder, K. S., Foster, T. E., & Zawoyski, A. M. (2016). Repeated versus wide reading: A randomized control design study examining the impact of fluency interventions on underlying reading behavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 59, 13-38.
- Blatchford P., & Webster R. (2014). Support staff: the role and effective deployment of teaching assistants in schools in England and Wales. *IOE Research Briefing N° 88*. London: IOE.
- Boardman, A. G., Vaughn, S., Buckley, P., Reutebuch, C., Roberts, G., & Klingner, J. (2016). Collaborative Strategic Reading for Students with Learning Disabilities in Upper Elementary Classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, 82(4), 409-427.
- Bowyer-Crane, C., Snowling, M. J., Duff, F. J., Fieldsend, E., Carroll, J. M., Miles, J., Götz, K. & Hulme, C. (2008). Improving early language and literacy skills: differential effects of an oral language versus a phonology with reading intervention. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), 422-432.
- Brooks, G. (2016). *What works for pupils with literacy difficulties: the effectiveness of intervention schemes* (5th ed.). Farnham: The Dyslexia-SpLD Trust.
- Charlton, B., Williams, R. L. & McLaughlin T. F. (2005). Educational Games: A Technique to Accelerate the Acquisition of Reading Skills of Children with Learning Disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 20(2), 66-72.
- Christensen, C. A. & Bowey, J. A. (2005). The Efficacy of Orthographic Rime, Grapheme-Phoneme Correspondence, and Implicit Phonics Approaches to Teaching Decoding Skills. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9(4), 327-349.
- Cirino, P. T., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2009). One-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Spanish and English Interventions for English Language Learners at Risk for Reading Problems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 744-781.
- Clarke, P. J., Snowling, M. J., Truelove, E. & Hulme, C. (2010). Ameliorating Children’s Reading-Comprehension Difficulties: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Psychological Science*, 21(8), 1106-1116.
- Clay, M. M. (1994). Reading Recovery: The Wider Implications of an Educational Innovation. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 121-141.
- Dickinson, D. K. & Smith, M. W. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29(2), 105-122.

THE INTEGRATED GROUP READING (IGR) APPROACH

- Di Stasio, M. R., Savage, R. & Abrami, P. C. (2010). A follow-up study of the ABRACADABRA web-based literacy intervention in Grade 1: ABRACADABRA: a follow-up study. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 35(1), 69-86.
- Doyle, M. A. (2013). Marie M. Clay's theoretical perspective: A literacy processing theory. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. Newark DE: International Reading Association.
- Duff, F. J., Fieldsend, E., Bowyer-Crane, C., Hulme, C., Smith, G., Gibbs, S., & Snowling, M. J. (2008). Reading with vocabulary intervention: evaluation of an instruction for children with poor response to reading intervention. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 31(3), 319-336.
- EEF (2015). *Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants: Guidance Report*. London: EEF.
- Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Stahl, S. A. & Willows, D. M. (2001). Systematic Phonics Instruction Helps Students Learn to Read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(3), 393-447.
- Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Tejero Hughes, M. & Watson Moody, S. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605-619.
- Florian, L. and Black-Hawkins, K. (2011) Exploring Inclusive Pedagogy, *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813-28.
- Ford, M. P., & Opitz, M. F. (2008). A national survey of guided reading practices: What we can learn from primary teachers. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47(4), 309-331.
- Fien, H., Smith, J. L. M., Smolkowski, K., Baker, S. K., Nelson, N. J., & Chaparro, E. (2015). An Examination of the Efficacy of a Multitiered Intervention on Early Reading Outcomes for First Grade Students at Risk for Reading Difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 48(6), 602-621.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(1), 93-99.
- Galuschka, K., Ise, E., Krick, K. & Schulte-Körne, G. (2014). Effectiveness of Treatment Approaches for Children and Adolescents with Reading Disabilities: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *PLoS ONE*, 9(2), e89900.
- Griffiths, Y., & Stuart, M. (2013). Reviewing evidence-based practice for pupils with dyslexia and literacy difficulties. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 36(1), 96-116.
- Hatcher, P. J., Hulme, C., Miles, J. N. V., Carroll, J. M., Hatcher, J., Gibbs, S., Smith, G., Bowyer-Crane, C., & Snowling, M. J. (2006). Efficacy of small group reading intervention for beginning readers with reading-delay: a randomised controlled trial: Efficacy of small group reading intervention. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(8), 820-827.
- Henbest, V. S. & Apel, K. (2017). Effective Word Reading Instruction: What Does the Evidence Tell Us? *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 1-9.
- Iaquinta, A. (2006). Guided reading: A research-based response to the challenges of early reading instruction. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(6), 413-418.
- Isbell, R., Sobol, J., Lindauer, L. & Lowrance, A. (2004). The Effects of Storytelling and Story Reading on the Oral Language Complexity and Story Comprehension of Young Children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(3), 157-163.
- Jaeger, E. L. (2016). Intensity of Focus, Richness of Content: Crafting Tier 2 Response to Intervention in an Era of the Common Core. *The Reading Teacher*, 70(2), 179-188.
- Jasmine, J. & Schiesl, P. (2009). The Effects of Word Walls and Word Wall Activities on the Reading Fluency of First Grade Students. *Reading Horizons; Kalamazoo*, 49(4), 301-314.
- Johnston, R. S. & Watson, J. E. (2004). Accelerating the development of reading, spelling and phonemic awareness skills in initial readers. *Reading and Writing*, 17(4), 327-357.
- Kyle, F., Kujala, J., Richardson, U., Lyytinen, H., & Goswami, U. (2013). Assessing the Effectiveness of Two Theoretically Motivated Computer-Assisted Reading Interventions in the United Kingdom: GG Rime and GG Phoneme. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(1), 61-76.

B. NORWICH AND G. KOUTSOURIS

- Lovett, M. W., De Palma, M., Frijters, J., Steinbach, K., Temple, M., Benson, N., & Lacerenza, L. (2008). Interventions for Reading Difficulties: A Comparison of Response to Intervention by ELL and EFL Struggling Readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41*(4), 333-352.
- Miller, D., Topping, K. & Thurston, A. (2010). Peer tutoring in reading: The effects of role and organization on two dimensions of self-esteem. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 417-433.
- Nation, K. & Snowling, M. J. (2004). Beyond phonological skills: broader language skills contribute to the development of reading. *Journal of Research in Reading, 27*(4), 342-356.
- NLS (1998). *National Literacy Strategies: Framework for Teaching*. London: DfEE.
- Norwich, B. (2014). Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: living with uncertainty. London: Routledge.
- Norwich, B., Koutsouris, G. & Bessudnov A. (2018). *An innovative classroom reading intervention for Year 2 and 3 pupils who are struggling to learn to read: Evaluating the Integrated Group Reading (IGR) programme – Project Report*. Accessed from: <http://www.integratedgroupreading.co.uk/>
- Peck, J. (1989). Using Storytelling to Promote Language and Literacy Development. *The Reading Teacher, 43*(2), 138-141.
- Pinnell, G. S. & Fountas, I. C. (2010). *Research base for guided reading as an instructional approach*. Scholastic.com.
- Raffaële Mendez, L. M., Pelzmann, C. A., & Frank, M. J. (2016). Engaging Struggling Early Readers to Promote Reading Success: A Pilot Study of Reading by Design. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 32*(3), 273-297.
- Reynolds, M., & Wheldall, K. (2007). Reading Recovery 20 years down the track: Looking forward, looking back. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 54*(2), 199-223.
- Ritchey, K. D., Silverman, R. D., Montanaro, E. A., Speece, D. L., & Schatschneider, C. (2012). Effects of a Tier 2 Supplemental Reading Intervention for At-Risk Fourth-Grade Students. *Exceptional Children, 78*(3), 318-334.
- Rose, J. (2006). *Independent review of the teaching of early reading: Interim report*. London: DFES.
- See, B. H., Gorard, S., & Siddiqui, N. (2015). Best practice in conducting RCTs: Lessons learnt from an independent evaluation of the Response-to-Intervention programme. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 47*, 83-92.
- Shannon, L. C., Styers, M. K., Wilkerson, S. B., & Peery, E. (2015). Computer-Assisted Learning in Elementary Reading: A Randomized Control Trial. *Computers in the Schools, 32*(1), 20-34.
- Stebbing, J. (2016). Integrated Group Reading Project website. Retrieved January 20, 2017, from <http://www.integratedgroupreading.co.uk/>
- Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's Emergent Reading of Favorite Storybooks: A Developmental Study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20*(4), 458-481.
- Torgerson, C., Brooks, G. & Hall, J. (2006) A systematic review of the research literature on the use of phonics in the teaching of reading and spelling. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Herron, J., & Lindamood, P. (2010). Computer-assisted instruction to prevent early reading difficulties in students at risk for dyslexia: Outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Annals of Dyslexia, 60*(1), 40-56.
- Vaughn, S., Solís, M., Miciak, J., Taylor, W. P., & Fletcher, J. M. (2016). Effects from a Randomized Control Trial Comparing Researcher and School-Implemented Treatments with Fourth Graders with Significant Reading Difficulties. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 9*(sup1), 23-44.
- Topping, K. J. (2014) Paired Reading and Related Methods for Improving Fluency. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education; Kutahya, 7*(1), 57-69.
- Topping, K. J. & Lindsay, G. A. (1992). Paired reading: a review of the literature. *Research Papers in Education, 7*(3), 199-246.
- Topping, K., Miller, D., Thurston, A., McGavock, K. & Conlin, N. (2011). Peer tutoring in reading in Scotland: thinking big: Peer tutoring in reading. *Literacy, 45*(1), 3-9.

THE INTEGRATED GROUP READING (IGR) APPROACH

- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education: adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and Quality*. Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June 1994. UNESCO.
- Valencia, S. W. & Sulzby, E. (1991). Assessment: Assessment of Emergent Literacy: Storybook Reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 44(7), 498-500.
- Walton, P. D., Walton, L. M. & Felton, K. (2001). Teaching rime analogy or letter recoding reading strategies to prereaders: Effects on prereading skills and word reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 160-180.
- Wanzek, J., & Roberts, G. (2012). Reading Interventions with Varying Instructional Emphases for Fourth Graders with Reading Difficulties. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 35(2), 90-101.
- Webster & Blatchford (2014). *The Making a Statement project: Final Report*. London: IOE.
- What Works Clearinghouse (2013) *Updated intervention report: Reading Recovery*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

AFFILIATIONS

Brahm Norwich
Graduate School of Education,
University of Exeter, UK

George Koutsouris
Graduate School of Education,
University of Exeter, UK